THE Nation

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 153 · NEW YORK · SATURDAY · JULY 26, 1941 · NUMBER 4

IN THIS ISSUE

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 61

EDITORIALS

Shall We Declare War? *by Freda Kirchwey* 64

Revive the Reuther Plan 65

ARTICLES

The G-String Conspiracy *by I. F. Stone* 66

Volcano Under Vichy *by Louis Dolivet* 67

Federal Union in Britain *by Barbara Wootton* 70

Lindbergh Eyes Minnesota *by Dale Kramer* 72

In the Wind 73

A Native at Large *by Jonathan Daniels* 74

BOOKS AND THE ARTS

The Unlamenting *by Rolfe Humphries* 75

Tate Versus History *by Randall Jarrell* 75

Wavell's War *by Peter Stevens* 76

The Massie Ore of British Letters *by Donald A. Roberts* 76

The Western Democracy *by Theresa Wolfson* 77

In Brief 79

Records *by B. H. Haggin* 79

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS 80

Editor and Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor ROBERT BENDINER · *Washington Editor* I. F. STONE · *Literary Editor* MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON · MAXWELL S. STEWART

Dramatic Critic
JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager and Director of Circulation
HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager
MARY HOWARD ELLISON

Published weekly and copyright, 1941, in the U. S. A. by The Nation, Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, December 13, 1879, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Washington Editorial Bureau: 856 National Press Building.

The Shape of Things

THE FIFTH WEEK OF THE GERMAN-RUSSIAN war finds the two huge armies still battling in the general neighborhood of the Stalin Line. The Nazi invaders retain the offensive, but their rate of progress has been reduced week by week since the campaign opened. They claim to have smashed through beyond Smolensk on the road to Moscow and to have cut the Russian central army into several fragments which can be destroyed in detail. But these claims remain as unsubstantiated as the German reports, now more than a week old, that Kiev and Leningrad were about to be captured. Parts of the Red Army may be in serious danger, but it seems to be putting up a stout fight, and behind the front Russia's huge reserves of man-power are being mustered into new lines of defense. Watching this tremendous struggle through a haze of censorship, many of us fear to forecast a favorable outcome, partly because of distrust of Soviet leadership, partly because frequent disappointments in the course of this war have made us lean backward to avoid wishful thinking. But it begins to be possible to ask questions which suggest hopeful answers. Can the Nazis before the snows come achieve a conclusive victory? Can they outlast Russia in man-power, shatter its means of resistance, and destroy it as an organized state without sacrifices of men and material which will leave them too weak to exploit their conquest? Is the decreasing news of tank battles, the increasing emphasis on infantry, a sign that oil reserves are getting low?

*

THE MINISTERIAL CHANGES IN BRITAIN bring into greater prominence some of the younger Tories who followed the Churchill line long before Munich, and should help to promote a more energetic prosecution of the war. But they leave unchanged the direction of civil defense and production, two departments which friendly critics of the government feel are not operating with maximum efficiency. Everyone agrees that the continued leadership of Mr. Churchill is indispensable, but he is being urged in many quarters to delegate some of his authority to a minister capable of supervising the home front with the same kind of energy

and vision which he himself devotes to the general diplomatic and military conduct of the war. The importance of the change at the Ministry of Information depends on whether Brendan Bracken, who succeeds Alfred Duff Cooper as its chief, has been given guaranties of greater freedom of action. Mr. Cooper was definitely not a success, but hamstrung as he was by the service departments and the Foreign Office, he hardly had a chance. Mr. Bracken has a great deal of drive and has the advantage of being close to the Premier, whose enthusiastic lieutenant he has been for years. As a publisher he understands news and newspapermen. Under his direction the London *Financial News* was resurrected to become a model of financial journalism—critical, courageous, and objective. It was one of the first British newspapers to grasp and explain the military character of Nazi economics. The appointment of Harold Nicolson to be a governor of the British Broadcasting Company should also strengthen British propaganda. It comes at a moment when Britain has scored a real success in the war of nerves with the imaginative "V" campaign.

*

THE NEW JAPANESE CABINET IS PERHAPS designed to give an appearance of strength and determination, heavily weighted as it is with army and navy officers, but even if its members are strong men they do not hold strong cards. The German invasion of Russia—launched, it is now believed, without any warning to Japan—left Matsuoka's policies in ruins. The Tripartite Pact has been exceedingly useful to the Axis in keeping British and American forces pegged down in the Far East. But up to date it has brought little benefit to Japan. By signing the non-aggression pact with Russia, Matsuoka hoped to neutralize the latent threat of Vladivostok and, perhaps, to enlarge the breach between the Chungking government and the Chinese Communists as the prelude to a conclusion of the "China incident." Now Tokyo finds Russia, China, Britain, and America lined up in one camp. It is rumored that Hitler is putting pressure on Japan to attack Russia, and that may well be so. But the Japanese know that the Soviet Far Eastern army is still large, that it has hundreds of bombers capable of reaching Tokyo, and that there is a large Russian submarine fleet based on Vladivostok. On the other hand, Japan may well hesitate to turn south so long as Britain's new ally constitutes a threat to its rear. No wonder Japanese commentators suggest that a more independent policy will now be followed and that foreign observers foresee a cautious interval before any new move is made. If Hitler is successful in destroying Russia's western armies and disorganizing the Soviet government, then the gamble of an attack on Eastern Siberia might be tried. But until the situation in European Russia is clearer it seems likely that Tokyo will mark time, unless it attempts to regain face cheaply by occupying Indo-China.

MAYOR LAGUARDIA WILL RUN AGAIN IN response to a demand from all the reform and liberal groups in New York politics. This is good news. The Mayor has provided an example of vigorous, honest, nonpartisan administration. The campaign this year will be a real one because Tammany is putting its strength behind an effective and appealing candidate—District Attorney William O'Dwyer. But if the Mayor gets the Republican nomination as well as that of the Labor Party, he should win. We cannot, however, record our indorsement of his candidacy without expressing regret at his refusal—and the refusal of the Labor Party—to support the reelection of Stanley Isaacs as Borough President of Manhattan. Mr. Isaacs's record has been excellent. His only sins are honesty and courage. He is being sacrificed chiefly because he refused to dismiss the Communist, Simon Gerson, from the position of confidential examiner. Mr. Isaacs contended that Gerson was hard-working and efficient and that his political connection was not a legal bar to his employment. It is a sad day when a fine public servant like Isaacs is repudiated by the liberal elements in the community for standing by his liberal principles.

*

FOR THE FIRST TIME THE ADMINISTRATION has openly recognized the fact that Franco is on the side of the Axis and that appeasement has not worked. Sumner Welles's announcement that Germany is contemplating action in Spain fits all the known facts—facts which have been frequently pointed out in *The Nation*. Mr. Welles is wrong only in describing the prospective move as an "aggression." When the time comes, Hitler's troops will simply walk through Spain, while his ally, Franco, spreads flowers along the roads to Gibraltar and Portugal. In the speech to which Mr. Welles objected Franco went much farther in enmity to the United States than the Acting Secretary revealed. He not only accused this government of sending help to Spain only to support the British position, but announced boldly that the United States was mistaken if it thought it could "buy ideas with food." Although Mr. Welles insists that the food was sent purely in a humanitarian effort to save the Spanish people from starvation, we believe Franco's interpretation is closer to the facts. But it is worth pointing out that the bribe was accepted, however indignantly its terms may now be rejected.

*

BOLIVIA'S SUDDEN ACTION IN DECLARING a state of siege, expelling the German minister, and arresting pro-Nazi Bolivians to forestall an attempt at a putsch dramatizes the constant threat of such movements to the unstable regimes of many Latin American countries. The President of Bolivia says he has documents to prove that the attempt was directed from the German

legation. The coup was prematurely launched, according to reports, because the Nazis were losing ground and the American blacklist decreed last week threatened to weaken them still more. Sumner Welles has promptly assured Bolivia of full American support in any complication resulting from the expulsion of the German minister. The Bolivian episode shows the effectiveness of such firm and specific moves by Washington, not only in checking Nazi activities but in giving the harassed heads of Latin American nations a "pro-American" policy they can actually use as a stick with which to beat the Nazis. One of the objectives of the attempted putsch was to cut off the supply of Bolivian tin for the United States—which makes the ostriches of isolation, who repeat over and over again that Hitler has no designs on this or that part of the universe, look even sillier than their feathered models.

✶

AN EXAMPLE OF ADEQUATE PLANNING FOR defense is provided by Leland Olds, dynamic chairman of the Federal Power Commission, in his report to the President outlining a coordinated program of private and public power expansion for each of the years 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946. The plans made by Mr. Olds after consultation with both public authorities and private companies call for an additional annual production of approximately 2,500,000 kilowatts by new steam generating-station units and 1,000,000 kilowatts by new hydro units. They would also place orders for new steam and hydro turbine generators sufficient to guarantee capacity operation of a portion of our electrical-equipment industry to be reserved for that purpose. This would cost from $150,000,000 to $200,000,000 a year, but the expenditure on turbines as on power expansion as a whole would be self-liquidating, and Mr. Olds proposes that the RFC do the financing for both private and public companies. The stations generating 1,000,000 additional kilowatts of hydroelectric power to be installed in each of these years would be planned by the United States Engineering Corps, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the TVA at potential water-power sites as yet unused.

✶

CIVIL LIBERTIES HAVE STOOD THE STRAIN OF rearmament and war extremely well during the year ending June 1, according to the report of the American Civil Liberties Union. Two general facts emerge: first, that the Administration has been more intelligent and liberal in its attitude than either the general public or Congress; and, second, that despite an international policy aimed against fascism, public opinion and the authorities have been far more concerned with the activities of labor and the left. Unfortunately the Administration's record has now been broken, and the public's red-baiting tendency encouraged, by the indictment of a small Trotskyist group in Minneapolis for "seditious conspiracy"; this is discussed by I. F. Stone on another page. Before June 1 no federal prosecutions for opinion had been undertaken, and only five had been brought under state laws. Despite the newspaper excitement over strikes no worker had been prosecuted. The principal casualties of the year were the Communist Party, which was barred from the ballot in fifteen states, and Jehovah's Witnesses. The report prints a "Balance Sheet of Civil Liberties," listing, as condemned or commended, the main events of the year having to do with civil rights; it also contains a useful list of the chief issues pending in Congress and the courts.

✶

TOM GIRDLER IS STILL PRESIDENT OF THE Republic Steel Corporation, and it was Girdler who declared four and a half years ago that "he would go back to the farm and dig potatoes before he would sign with the C. I. O." But on July 15 Republic Steel, the National Labor Relations Board, and the Committee of Industrial Organizations signed a stipulation settling all charges of Wagner Act violations against the company. Moreover, if the NLRB certifies that the C. I. O. has a majority, the company will sign a contract with the union. Mr. Girdler explained his about-face with the simple remark that Republic is operating at top speed, much of its output is defense work, and "we want to avoid any letdown in production from any cause." Profits and patriotism work wonders, especially profits. Girdler's surrender marks an important victory for collective bargaining—and Republic workers reinstated by the agreement will receive tens of thousands of dollars in back pay; but the price of the victory included the lives of eighteen workers killed during the strike in Little Steel in 1937.

✶

AMONG THE MANY COURAGEOUS WOMEN and men who have carried on the hard fight to legalize birth control—risking personal and even professional attack in many cases—none won more general admiration than Dr. Hannah M. Stone. Her death robs the movement of one of its bravest and most useful workers. But, more than that, it robs this generation of one of its finest spirits. Dr. Stone was far less widely known than some of her colleagues. Public propaganda and the more sensational aspects of the crusade she left to others, though she never shunned necessary public action and was arrested after a raid on the Birth Control Clinical Research Bureau in 1929. Dr. Stone's contribution to the movement was made in the laboratory and the clinic, where she combined the highest scientific skill with a profound, quiet understanding of the emotional factors in successful family relationships. Her simplicity and candor and the clear fine quality of her mind made themselves felt in even the most casual personal contacts.

Shall We Declare War?

BY FREDA KIRCHWEY

THE New York *Post* and other advocates of more vigorous intervention are urging the President to ask Congress for a declaration of war. It is a natural desire. If this country declared war on Hitler, a dozen cords constricting action would be cut at a single stroke; the problem of coordinating our effort with that of Britain would be easily solved; and the rather confused but strong anti-Nazi feeling of the country would be concentrated and precipitated in action. War is the great catalyst.

But a declaration of war is a political act, not merely a military one. To ask for such a declaration today would precipitate a battle in Congress and the country that might stall rather than accelerate the program of defense and help for Britain. The war between the isolationist and interventionist forces would distract the public mind from the greater war in which, without any declaration, we are inextricably and actively engaged. Lines would be drawn even more bitterly than now, and the country would present a scene of division that, for all the world, would obscure the true, all-but-unanimous sentiment in favor of unlimited resistance to Hitler. Many supporters of the present policy of the Administration would swing over to the opposition. And even if a declaration of war were finally voted, its value would have been diminished by the fight that brought it into being.

I think the President is wise beyond his pro-war supporters. He has sensed the fact, pointed out editorially in these pages last week, that the people will accept the logic and necessity of a specific act where they would dispute endlessly the general theories on which that act was based. Public opinion has supported unfailingly every step this country has taken in defense of its interests. But the people still hesitate before the ultimate commitment of war. Or rather, if war is necessary, they prefer to look upon it as a last resort, to be arrived at only after all other means have been tried, even if some of those means are themselves probable forerunners of war.

It is this preference that the President defers to in laying down his policy. It is a preference that I believe he shares. It fits in with the quarterback theory of government and with the Roosevelt temperament. I do not quarrel with it or urge that it be abandoned. On the contrary, I believe it is strategically necessary. But its dangers are many and obvious. It means that too little may be done at any one time—when time is as precious as tanks or bombers. While Russia carries on its titanic resistance, the anti-Nazi forces of the world are given a brief but tremendous chance to turn the war against Hitler. The alternative is the chance that Hitler will swing back against the West, reinforced with vast new resources of material and power and with new security. The hour demands action on a great scale, not bit-by-bit increases in tempo and effort. It demands a series of moves designed to put the unlimited energy and resources of America more fully and quickly into the struggle.

The occupation of Iceland was one such move. Its effect has been to convert the Atlantic patrol into an armed defense of the ship lanes between our coastline and the longitude of Iceland—three-fourths of the way to Britain. The blacklist of pro-Axis concerns in Latin America was another. The dislocations in trade occasioned by this boycott will be offset many times over by its effect as a clear statement of American policy. It is an act of economic and political war which will speak louder than all the moral utterances of statesmen or the resolutions of conferences and in a language that the Nazis understand. They understand, too, the arrest of agents and spies and the expulsion of Axis consuls. Without breaking diplomatic relations the United States has moved to wipe out a large part of the undiplomatic relations carried on through propaganda, sabotage, and subversion.

On Monday the President took still another important step which served at once to strengthen the defense effort and announce the nation's determination to carry out its proclaimed purposes. Facing strong opposition in Congress, he demanded legislation to extend the service of drafted men and of various categories of reserve forces and to remove the limitation on the number that may be called. This took courage. Both in the ranks of the new army and in the greater ranks of their relatives and friends an extension of service will cause hardship—in spite of efforts to avoid it—and create ill-feeling. The men were drafted for one year. The isolationists have already cried out against this "breach of faith," although the law clearly provides that their service can be extended if Congress finds that a national emergency exists. The President not only stressed this point but expressed his sober belief that a far greater emergency exists today than at the time the law was passed—or at any time since then. He placed upon Congress the responsibility of facing the situation and taking the necessary steps.

All this is good. But it must be said in behalf of those who demand the full and final measure of war that we have arrived at each moment of action after delays which seemed sometimes to threaten the success of the whole anti-fascist struggle. And the steps taken have been inadequate as well as late. Axis consuls and agents should have been thrown out months ago; the firms in Latin America should have been blacklisted when their pro-Nazi activities first became apparent—and that was long before Nelson Rockefeller's committee was heard of. To this day the defense setup, as we have said in almost

every issue of *The Nation,* is riddled through with business executives whose whole outlook is distorted by the private interests which "lend" them to the government. The State Department is filled with men whose sympathies are hostile to every democratic ideal we hope to defend—men who are anti-alien, anti-Semitic, and reactionary, however honestly they may desire the military defeat of Hitler. Our refugee policy is a mockery of democratic principles. The neutrality law still throttles necessary action in the use of both ships and men. Our pretended neutrality permits the continuance of such dangerous anomalies as the shipment of foodstuffs to Spain and oil to Vichy and Japan. Our attempts at propaganda, especially in Latin America, are at best amateurish and ineffective.

A coordinated, uncompromising, democratic struggle can be waged only if these obstacles are rapidly overcome. And so far the President, whose purposes no one could doubt, still draws back from the drastic measures necessary to put those purposes into effect. A declaration of war is not what this country needs. It needs instead a course of action broadly conceived, honestly explained to the people, and courageously carried out by men and women who know what the fight against fascism means and what it demands of American democracy.

Revive the Reuther Plan

THE NATION is fully in accord with Leon Henderson's order for a 50 per cent cut in the production of automobiles, mechanical refrigerators, and electric washing machines. It was time someone in Washington had the courage to put a stop to the boom which has been going on in these industries at the expense of the defense program. Whether the "order" is carried out or not depends in large part on the President, for the line of demarcation between the Office of Production Management and Henderson's Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply is not clear. An executive order clarifying the conflict between them has been awaiting Mr. Roosevelt's signature at the White House for some time, and until it is signed the automobile manufacturers may find it as easy to defy Mr. Henderson as it was to disregard similar orders by Mr. Baruch in the last war.

The controversy over continued boom production of automobiles goes to the heart of the problem raised by the present setup in defense. Automobile executives, most of them from General Motors, play a dominant role in the OPM but have so far shown themselves, from Mr. Knudsen down, more anxious to defend their industry than to turn its facilities to defense purposes; and there have been mutterings in Washington for more than a week that the automobile crowd would "get" Mr. Henderson if he interfered with their "business as usual."

Although Mr. Knudsen some weeks ago asked the industry for a "voluntary" 20 per cent cut in automobile production, this widely ballyhooed sacrifice would leave Detroit's volume of motor-car output at above-normal 1940 levels. Automobile production has in recent months been running a third above last year's, and a 20 per cent cut might be no sacrifice at all, for most dealers suspect that this year's sales have eaten into next year's market. Mr. Knudsen would cut car production by 1,000,000; Mr. Henderson by 2,500,000. The principal need for the cut derives from the high proportion of alloy steels consumed by the motor-car industry. These alloy steels are of particular importance to defense. Every 1,000 cars, as Mr. Henderson explained to the press in Washington, uses 31,598 pounds of nickel steel, 1,491 pounds of nickel, and 1,493 tons of steel.

The automobile industry is also a heavy consumer of other raw materials vital to defense, notably aluminum. Every 1,000 cars uses 1,104 pounds of primary aluminum and 4,599 pounds of secondary aluminum, that is, scrap aluminum. Every 1,000 cars also requires 18,630 pounds of zinc, 5,040 pounds of chromium, 48,613 pounds of copper, 33,854 pounds of lead, 3,409 pounds of tin, 17 pounds of tungsten, and 14 pounds of magnesium. There are serious shortages in every one of these metals.

The automobile industry has been the pampered darling of the dollar-a-year men at the OPM, absorbing vital materials badly needed for defense and for civilian goods of greater importance than automobiles. The decision made by the President in the coming tug-of-war between Mr. Henderson and Mr. Knudsen will reveal whether he is really prepared to adopt stern measures or is still intent on appeasing the business men. His decision will be watched not only by liberals but by all in favor of all-out aid and in particular by the War and Navy departments, which have grown more and more rebellious over conditions permitting vital defense orders to be held up for lack of alloy steels and aluminum while the automobile industry gets all the steel and aluminum it needs.

In this connection it becomes all the more important to resume the campaign for adoption of the Reuther plan, first described in the pages of *The Nation* last December. Curtailment of automobile production without corresponding plans for diversion of the industry's facilities to the production of planes and other instruments of war would be doubly wasteful. It would leave valuable machinery idle and it would waste a huge reservoir of skilled man power. Moreover, diversion of facilities is important not only for the speedup of defense production but to prevent unemployment. Nothing could be more dangerous to morale than the spectacle of increased unemployment at a time when the need for greater defense production is more urgent than ever.

The G-String Conspiracy

BY I. F. STONE

Washington, July 20

I DO not think I am expounding a novel proposition when I suggest that you cannot kill an idea by putting its spokesmen in jail. The indictment obtained by the Department of Justice against the leaders of the Trotskyist Socialist Workers' Party and Local 544 in Minneapolis indicate that this is one of those platitudes better understood in the writing than in the making of history. The indictments say that the leaders of the Socialist Workers' Party, unless placed in jail, may overthrow the government of the United States, a task which would seem to call for more than a handful of men. The party claims that it has but 3,000 members. The department promises at the proper time to bring forward evidence to prove that the Socialist Workers' Party has all of 5,000.

Against this political gnat the government is about to let go with both barrels. One count of the indictments is based on the Smith Alien and Sedition Act, which Congress passed last year over the objections of such radicals as Paul Scharrenberg of the American Federation of Labor. The other count is based on Section 6, Chapter 18, of the United States Code, which makes seditious conspiracy a felony. "Off the record" at least one official engaged in the prosecution is prepared to admit that the Supreme Court may find the sedition provisions of the Smith act unconstitutional. For the first time in peace since the Alien and Sedition Laws of John Adams a mere expression of opinion is made a federal crime. Under these provisions a man might be sent to jail for ten years because he circulated such un-American documents as the Declaration of Independence and Lincoln's Second Inaugural, for both "advocate, abet, advise, or teach the duty, necessity, desirability, or propriety of overthrowing or destroying any government" by force. It is felt in the department that though this may be too much for the court, the convictions will stand under Section 6. There can be no doubt that Section 6 is constitutional. It was written to cope not with mere opinion but with an actual uprising. It was enacted in 1861 to deal with the Rebellion. The question is whether the courts will find it possible to equate the faint cannonading of Trotskyist popguns with the firing on Fort Sumter.

The rebellion of which the Trotskyist leaders of Local 544 are guilty was leaving the A. F. of L. for the C. I. O. Since the Trotskyists have been for revolution for a good many years and the Dunne brothers have been in control of Local 544 for a decade, one is entitled to wonder why no action was ever taken against them so long as they were content to carry on their subversive activities within Dan Tobin's International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Wendell Berge, assistant attorney general in charge of the Criminal Division in the Department of Justice, told me that while the actual decision to prosecute came after the union decided to leave Tobin's union for the C. I. O., the timing was a "fortuitous occurrence." The New York and Minneapolis offices of the FBI have been collecting material on the Trotskyists and on Local 544 for some time, and it may have been a happy coincidence which enabled the case to be filed in time to do a political favor for Mr. Tobin. The liberals in the department are either unhappy or confused about the case. Shrewder and more determined influences see in this prosecution of an easily isolated and unpopular minority a chance to establish precedents which can be applied more broadly. If the leaders of Local 544 can be convicted for their opinions, so can others, and the National Maritime Union and the American Communications Association are next on the list.

No one questions the right of a government to protect itself, not only against overt acts but even against the expression of ideas, when there is really, in the formula of Justices Holmes and Brandeis, "a clear and present danger" that they will precipitate disorder or revolutionary action. Though the indictments allege that the Socialist Workers' Party is preparing to take over the government, officials of the department look pained when one asks them about this charge. On the department's estimates, 1/260 of 1 per cent of the people of this country belong to the Socialist Workers' Party. In the Twin Cities, the party's stronghold, the ratio is much higher. There the party membership is 1/18 of 1 per cent of the population. No minority is too small to cause some trouble, but the burden of proof is on the Justice Department.

To Acting Attorney General Biddle, to Mr. Berge, and finally to Henry Schweinhaut, who is in charge of the prosecutions, I put the same questions: "What did these people *do?* What were they *about* to do? In what way did they menace Minneapolis?" All three were kind enough to discuss the case at length with me, but Mr. Biddle said he was not familiar enough with it to answer these questions and suggested that I ask Mr. Berge. Mr. Berge was also unable to provide particulars and suggested that I ask Mr. Schweinhaut when the latter returned from Minneapolis. Mr. Biddle, as Acting Attor-

ney General, had to approve the prosecution before it could be begun. Mr. Berge heads the division in charge of the case. Without allegations as to overt acts or some clear and present danger these prosecutions are prosecutions of opinion. Yet Mr. Biddle and Mr. Berge were willing to take responsibility for them without the full inquiry warranted by a step so out of accord with our free traditions. If I understood Mr. Biddle rightly, he thinks a government need not wait for an overt act but can punish men for the probable consequences which would result if they tried to put their ideas into action. This reasoning is no different from that on which Trotskyists are jailed in the Third Reich or the Soviet Union. On this basis Thoreau could have been kept in jail for life.

From Mr. Schweinhaut I obtained a bill of particulars. They were not impressive. He is a well-meaning young man who headed the moribund Civil Liberties Division of the department until recently. He is now in charge of Commercial Frauds. He brought out pamphlets and quotations from speeches to prove that the Trotskyists do not believe in democratic processes and are opposed to participation in the war. He charged that party members were favored in the distribution of jobs through Local 544 and that every effort was made to place party members in key positions in other unions. He said the union had organized a defense guard of from 200 to 500 members—estimates vary. He said the defense guard had from ten to fifty guns to practice with and that its members did calisthenics regularly. The government has evidence that on one particular evening there was a test mobilization which brought all members of the guard to union headquarters within an hour. "What did they do when they got there?" I asked him. Mr. Schweinhaut said they went to the Gaiety, a local burlesque house. He said each admission cost 75 cents, and the government wants to know who paid for the tickets. This was told me in all seriousness. I have heard of the Gunpowder Plot. Maybe this will go down in history as the G-String Conspiracy.

Volcano Under Vichy

BY LOUIS DOLIVET

ALMOST unnoticed, a profound political crisis is shaking the puppet governments of Europe, especially Vichy. An immense movement coming from the very soul of the French people is destroying every kind of collaboration suggested by the Pétain government.

In a little French village in unoccupied France, in the department of Corrèze, lives M. Spinasse, formerly Finance Minister of the Popular Front government. At present he is head of a notorious paper, *l'Effort,* which advocates collaboration between the French Socialists and the German National Socialists. Pétain and Laval were particularly proud to win this man for their pro-German policy, for they hoped through him to penetrate the ranks of the French Socialist movement. Their experience with him, however, as with so many others, has been a severe disappointment. During the first weeks the workers bought the paper, attracted by the names of prominent members of the Popular Front government which were printed on the masthead. But after they had read its contents they organized a real boycott against it. This boycott was extended to include Spinasse himself. In his own village every house is closed to him. In the evenings one can see a sad man walking through the streets of the village. Nobody has a friendly word for him; nobody replies to his greeting.

Another "collaborationist"—I mentioned him in an earlier article in *The Nation*—is Georges Dumoulin, head of the important Northern Trade Unions, who has been the leader of a pro-German labor group. He edits, with the help of the German authorities and for their benefit, a paper called *l'Atelier.* Two months ago this old labor leader became the object of such hostility from the union rank and file that he was forced to resign.

One after another, the leading supporters of collaboration are being silenced by the hostile attitude of the people of France. They are one and all regarded as traitors and ruthlessly barred from every honest family. The Vichy government, powerless against this wave of popular feeling, is trying its best to change the situation. The Marshal himself addresses the workers, but he does not speak their language; he uses words which they never understood and never liked. He says to them: "Follow me blindly. The wrong policy of the previous government led you into this situation. *I* will save you." The French workers, with their strong political traditions, do not like to be told to follow blindly. They do not believe that Pétain will save them, for he never belonged to them. For many years they have feared that he would one day become a dictator, and they hate him.

René Bélin, a former secretary of the trade-union movement and now Labor Minister for Vichy, having been informed of this situation, decided to pay a visit to the unions of unoccupied France. His trip had few results.

THE HOPWOOD LIBRARY

When he spoke, three or four hundred workers came to listen to him, in hostile silence. One of his secretaries made a speech pointing out the differences between occupied and unoccupied France, and emphasizing the better condition of the workers in the unoccupied zone. A heckler retorted sharply that there was no difference at all, for the German authorities in effect dominated the whole of France. This attitude is characteristic not only of the workers but also of the intellectuals and peasants. Even strongly religious groups are showing more and more determined resistance to the Germans and their French supporters.

Controversies between different groups of collaborationists are being publicly aired in the newpapers. A great press battle is being fought between the Monarchist paper *l'Action Française* and the Socialist collaborationist paper *l'Effort*. Apparently it started with the question of who was responsible for the war and the defeat, but in reality both papers are trying to justify the policy of collaboration.

The political crisis within the collaborationist group is even better illustrated by the letter in which M. Tixier-Vignancourt, who for years advocated fascist policies in the French Parliament, resigned as associate secretary-general of the Central Committee of Social Propaganda. "Rhetorical declarations against the trusts," he wrote, "are contradicted by the allocation of raw materials. The organization committees [governmental committees to organize French industries] are giving their full support to the big industries, but they allow the artisan and the little enterprises to die. Suppression of news about proletarian conditions does not prevent salaries from being reduced to a famine level or mitigate the general misery."

The situation to which he refers is largely due to the control over big French industries which has been obtained by German firms. The Nazi authorities, with the cooperation of Vichy, have forced French owners to sell their shares to German competitors, often by methods amounting to blackmail. One result has been a wave of speculation exceeding the worst days of the financial crash of 1929. Another is that every Franco-German firm is trying to obtain the greatest possible quantity of raw materials, no matter what the cost, by bribing the members of the organization committees.

But the economic confusion is overshadowed by political problems. The Pétain policy as explained to the French people was based on two principal arguments. The first was that the war had already been won by Germany and that American help would come too late to save England. But this argument is not borne out by events; the French people know that Great Britain is receiving more and more help from America. And they know that the British, instead of being ousted from the Near East by July as predicted by the French press, have succeeded, on the contrary, in forcing the capitulation of the German and Vichy troops in Syria.

The second argument consisted in saying that only by collaboration with Germany could the vital interests of France be secured. Daily life proves the contrary to the average Frenchman. He sees that the Germans are taking almost everything from France and giving almost nothing in return. Thousands of pamphlets distributed in France denounce the speakers of the press and radio as liars when they say that the economic difficulties of France are due to the British blockade. The pamphlets state correctly that France never imported wheat or eggs or other products of primary necessity. "Let us only expel the Germans," they conclude, "and we will have plenty to eat."

The French people are refusing to accept the fascist conception of the state, though the German and Vichy police and military machinery are crushing ruthlessly every attempt at resistance. Arrests are becoming more and more numerous, and concentration camps are filled with priests, workers, peasants, and political leaders. The situation is entirely different from that prevailing in Germany. There the National Socialist Party has millions of followers and nationalist arguments can be used in support of Hitler, who has made so many conquests for Germany. In France all the fascist parties together have only 150,000 members. They were negligible before the war; they are insignificant now. The Germans are foreign enemies imposing upon the French people a regime against which the French people have fought steadily for 150 years. No propaganda can overcome the profound popular opposition to fascism.

Resolutions presented by the trade unions to the provincial governors on May 1, 1941, contained not a single sentence approving a policy of collaboration with the Germans. On the contrary, they demanded the complete independence of France, and all ended with the words, "Long live the General Confederation of Workers" (the French national trade-union organization dissolved by the Vichy government). In a secret pamphlet distributed throughout the country, the French Socialist group officially accused the leaders of the ruling class of participation in an international conspiracy against the French Republic, and of having preferred Hitler to the Popular Front.

The German invasion of Russia changed the situation for the whole of Europe but especially for France. The policy of alliance and cooperation with Russia is a tradition in French history, whatever the Russian regime may be. In the years before the war the middle-class Radical Socialist Party, the Socialist Party of Léon Blum, the trade-union membership of 5,000,000, the agricultural societies and cooperatives with a membership of 200,000 families adopted at their conventions innu-

merable resolutions in favor of an alliance with Soviet Russia. The Communist Party, a strong political force in France, naturally advocated the same policy. During the Spanish war and at the time of the Munich crisis many important voices in France, from the most diverse quarters, warned against an anti-Russian policy. Especially from 1938 on, the best French minds strongly advocated this alliance. It is difficult to speak for those who are still in France and, naturally, in danger, but I may mention men like Pierre Cot, member of seven different French governments; Henri de Kerillis, former editor of a conservative paper; Pertinax, the well-known French journalist; Henri Laugier, former chief of the French Institute for Scientific Research. Despite ideological differences, all agreed that the military interests of France demanded an alliance with Russia against Hitler.

The Russo-German pact was naturally a great disappointment to the French people, and the Communist Party lost most of its followers. But now the situation is completely changed. The Russians are putting up a splendid fight; they are again the allies of the democracies. Consequently it is the Germans who now have to reckon with the hostility of the 1,500,000 followers of the Communist Party. The radical elements are concentrated in vital industrial areas around Paris. The large automobile, tank, and aircraft factories, the railways, and the chemical industry are strongly impregnated with them. Intensified sabotage is certain

Immediately after the attack on Russia, Germany and the puppet authorities launched an openly reactionary policy. All talk of socialism receded into the background, and the purely fascist character of the new order became much clearer, even to men of little political education. But the appeal of the aristocrats and fascists for the formation of a French Legion to fight "against Bolshevism" met very little response from the public, and the government dropped the entire plan. Pétain's reactionary trend is plainly seen in his nomination of Pierre Bucheu, representative of the Comité des Forges (the French steel and iron trust), to be Minister of the Interior, with full control over the police forces of the country.

The Russian war introduced into the situation a new factor injurious to Germany and Vichy just as the Germans were withdrawing their best troops and air forces from France and as Vichy was meeting defeat in Syria and contemplating the bankruptcy of its diplomacy in the Far East, where Indo-China may be lost completely very soon. At the same time the R. A. F. was intensifying its bombing of military and industrial targets in France, and the United States was demonstrating its determination to help defeat Hitler. The question now is whether the Allies will utilize this situation to create a new threat to Germany. The latest news from France shows a daily increase of popular resistance. From Belgium and Holland, where the Communists are far from having as much importance as in France, reliable information indicates that the people are awaiting decisive Allied action. In considering the advisability of a British counter-invasion of occupied Europe, the opportunities that such a move would create for other offensive actions should not be neglected. Allied strategists must of course reckon with the Nazi forces remaining in Western Europe and must expect that Hitler would promptly rush reinforcements against an invasion army. But the reinforcements would come chiefly from the Russian front, and the withdrawal of large units from that line would offer new offensive possibilities to the Russians. A counter-invasion would be the first act to create great difficulties for the German High Command. The risks which were taken for Crete, Greece, and Yugoslavia should certainly be taken for Europe. They should be taken in order to utilize a great potential ally, the 200,000,000 people of occupied Europe, who would have the chance to engage in guerrilla warfare on a scale heretofore unknown in Europe.



Marshal Pétain

Such action presupposes a military and political strategy able to exploit without any ideological prejudice a unique situation in Europe. This unique situation will not last forever. The self-appointed rulers of France have tied themselves definitely to Hitler. Their game is subtle, and they are using old friendships in order to create confusion in the interest of the Germans—and to delay decisive action. Strong Allied pressure and the creation of a democratic Free French government would have an immediate effect. Many persons in important positions who are now hesitating would never allow themselves to be identified with German fascism. They are undecided at present because Vichy still says that it is "on excellent terms with the British and Americans."

Democracy can lose no more time—too much suffering is involved for the entire human race. Once the French people are in movement, the other peoples of the Continent will join them. They will follow France's initiative in launching the fight for freedom, as they did in 1789 and 1848. There can be no stronger appeal to humanity than the appeal to fight for liberty, independence, and democracy.

Federal Union in Britain

BY BARBARA WOOTTON

London (by air mail)

THE Federal Union movement in Great Britain began, as every political movement must begin, by somebody having an idea. That idea was, to quote the first of the society's minutes, to give "practical effect" to the "ordinary citizen's desire for the rule of an international law based on individual liberty." It was not, perhaps, a very new idea. Nevertheless, it remains as sensible and important as any political idea that was ever conceived; and any movement that does actually succeed in giving practical effect to this desire will indeed have accomplished something.

Federal Union was founded by two young men, Derek Rawnsley and Charles Kimber, six months before a great stimulus was given to the whole federal idea by the publication of the London edition of Streit's "Union Now." For a time English Federal Unionists multiplied rapidly; crowded meetings were held; pamphlets were issued. W. B. Curry's popular booklet, "The Case for Federal Union," sold 100,000 copies. Parallel movements sprang up on the Continent and in the British dominions.

Throughout the *Sitzkrieg* and the first blackout winter such progress continued steadily. It seemed that there was a real stirring of public opinion. But the setbacks began with the disastrous campaigns of 1940. Even then, Churchill's offer of union to France showed that the most realistic and responsible statesmen could think in terms which, only a year or two before, would have been dismissed as the dreams of woolly-minded utopians. But during the anxious months of late summer the demands of the war effort upon the time and energy of the public-spirited grew ever heavier and heavier. Then came the winter blitz, and first in London, then in other great cities it became impossible to arrange meetings.

At a critical moment the movement was lucky enough to get the services, as chairman of the directors, of R. W. G. Mackay, who is known to federalists on both sides of the Atlantic—and of the Pacific too, since Australia is his native land—for his "Federal Europe" and "Peace Aims and the New World Order." Mackay undertook the urgent job of overhauling and piecing together the somewhat shattered remains of the society and of grappling with the desperate need for money. These developments came to a head with the adoption of a new statement of policy by a delegate conference held at Oxford last January.

The new policy is a three-headed affair. It is an attempt to bring together all the essential elements in a twentieth-century conception of what democracy means, or must mean, if it is to be taken seriously and valued highly. The nineteenth-century notion that a 100 per cent satisfactory democratic way of life would be realized in a world of independent national states, each with a government elected by popular, or fairly popular, suffrage, is clearly quite out of touch with the ordinary requirements of ordinary folk. A state of brigandage would be a polite name for the habitual relations of these states; and the citizens of the democracies, much as they value their political freedom, have discovered that votes are poor food for empty bellies.

The new Federal Union policy is therefore a call for democracy on the international, the economic, and the political plane. International democracy is interpreted as the establishment of a common government with definite but limited powers in the fields of defense, foreign policy, and to some extent economic affairs, over states now independent of one another. Here the dividing line between the Federal Unionist and those who think only in terms of a revived League or some other looser form of international organization is the fact that the former will not be content unless the new international authority exercises power directly over individuals, and not merely over states as states. In his view a federation is not a federation unless it passes that test. That is not to say, however, that English federalists contemplate a world federal government emerging from the peace settlement. They are realistic enough to restrict their immediate objectives to limited federations, which, it is hoped, may be linked together in some less exacting and less ambitious form of world association.

That of course immediately raises the question of who is to federate with whom? Recent events on both sides of the Atlantic have naturally set people thinking about what might be made of the ever closer cooperation between Britain and the United States. There are those who drink quietly to Great Britain—the forty-ninth state. And now comes Streit again, this time with his "Union Now with Britain." A good many English federalists will support Streit's case, though they will not see it quite as he does. Others, less ambitious, are thinking in terms of the closest Anglo-American cooperation short of union—of common defense during the war and of at least the beginnings of common citizenship—as, for instance, by the release of Americans in England from the restrictions to which other aliens are subject.

But when full weight has been given to the eager and friendly eyes that the British federalist now turns toward the west, it still remains true that Europe is our problem and our destiny. Fortunately or unfortunately, we cannot tow this island away from its present situation and hitch it to the great continental democracy across the Atlantic. It was as a contribution toward a stable and peaceful order in war-torn Europe that the British Federal Union movement came into being; and it is in those terms that, ultimately, the British, or indeed any European, federalist still thinks and must continue to think.

And there the federalists have the field pretty much to themselves. For very little other thinking has yet been done about the possibilities of *long-term* political settlement. Many minds are already at work upon the probable immediate post-armistice needs of our unhappy continent and upon how best these may be met when the time comes. But beyond that point things are, generally speaking, left to take care of themselves. Perhaps this is inevitable for the present. The federalist, however, sticks to his thesis, repeating always that in the age of aviation and radio the independent states of Europe are an anachronism, and that we shall never have settled peace as long as their mere restoration is the limit of our vision.

The second strand in the new Federal Union policy is labeled economic democracy. The greatest challenge to the whole conception of democracy as a political idea is the apparent inability of the professing democracies to provide simple economic security for every man. Nobody is going to give much for reconstruction plans which do not successfully answer that challenge; and the man in the street is quite ready to be cynical about a democracy which does not care whether its citizens have work to do, food for themselves and their children, comfortable and healthy homes to live in, opportunity to develop their talents for their own pleasure and for the common good, and leisure which they may do what they like with. The Federal Union statement of policy demands, therefore, that these primary needs shall be the first charge upon the work and the resources of the community. To the question how this can best be done it does not attempt to give any simple or uniform answer. The obligation to lay down and enforce minima is recognized as the duty of an international authority. Methods must be adapted to the particular experience of particular countries.

The third section of the policy statement deals with political democracy. Here we have a demand for really representative government, together with the civil and political freedoms without which the mere business of voting is but a cruel mockery of real political choice. In England this aspect of democracy has a rather special significance owing to the peculiarities of our electoral system. It is now more than twenty years since there has been any general revision of the distribution of parliamentary seats. During those twenty years the population has been extensively on the move, and it may now easily happen that of two constituencies each of which is represented in Parliament by one member, one has three times as many electors as the other.

The policy as a whole, it will be seen, runs close to President Roosevelt's Four Freedoms. It is an attempt to think out some of the institutions, particularly in the sphere of international relations, which would be necessary to establish those freedoms securely. The Federal Union policy statement does actually incorporate a declaration that international government must rest upon a fundamental charter of rights and needs, which must include freedom of faith, association, and speech; the rule of law in both national and international affairs; the general advancement of standards of living; and a denial of privilege based on class, nationality, or other sectional interest and not justified by function.

None of this derives directly from the program of any political party. The Federal Union movement is not a political party in embryo, nor is it affiliated to any of the existing parties. It seeks, rather, to work in and through all parties. The present would, indeed, be an extremely unfavorable moment at which to launch a new party in Britain. Any such move would naturally incur all the odium of an attempt to disrupt national unity at a most critical moment. On the other hand, the times may prove to be as favorable to the germination of new political ideas as they are unpropitious for building new political organizations. Opinion generally is very fluid, and many old formulas begin to have a somewhat unreal sound in the rapidly changing world with which we are frantically trying to keep pace.

There is thus an unusual opportunity for an organization like Federal Union to arouse the interest of all parties by sending speakers to address their local meetings. Moreover, the Federal Union movement has, from the first, attracted a large number of people who have never before taken any active part in political life. This is itself indicative of the stirrings that are everywhere perceptible, even if they have not yet made much mark upon the surface of things. In the end it will be the large mass of the silent public without party affiliations whose opinions will determine the political pattern in Great Britain, and elsewhere, after the war.

The Federal Union movement has, as a matter of fact, found supporters in Conservative, Liberal, and Labor ranks. At least two members of the present government gave it public support before their lips were sealed by promotion to more exalted responsibility. On the whole, sympathizers are more often found in the Labor and Liberal parties than among Conservatives, since Federal Union runs in a stream of internationalism which is more conspicuous in the tradition of the left than in that of the right. Federal Unionists are attacked in about equal measure on the ground that their purpose is to make the

world safe for socialism, and on the ground that they wish to do the same for capitalism.

At the time of writing a strong drive is afoot to interest the trade-union world in the idea, and the appearance of the chairman of the Trades Union Congress on a Federal Union platform will no doubt give an impetus to this. But neither here nor anywhere else are dramatic results to be looked for in the immediate future. The vast majority of the people of Britain are too busy, and living under conditions of too great strain, to have much energy to spare from the demands of their daily occupations. Only when these strains are eventually relaxed shall we be able to learn what has been going on underneath the busy surface of civil and military duties.

Lindbergh Eyes Minnesota

BY DALE KRAMER

WHEN the New York *Daily News* recently suggested a Hoover-Lindbergh Presidential ticket for 1944, the ex-President promptly and publicly renounced any such aspiration. Lindbergh remained silent. Undoubtedly he and his advisers considered the suggestion ridiculous on two counts: that he should be relegated to second place; and that Hoover should be considered fit for a leading role in American politics of the future.

From Minnesota comes news of a possible strategy more in keeping with these blitzkrieg times. Political circles there feel certain that Lindbergh will seek the Republican nomination for the United States Senate in 1942—whether we enter the war or not. It would be an audacious move, but Lindbergh, whose father was a Minnesota Congressman, would stand a reasonably good chance of success in both primary and general elections.

The seat in question is occupied now by Joseph Ball, the youthful newspaper reporter who was appointed by Governor Harold E. Stassen after the death of Ernest Lundeen, Farmer-Laborite. It is expected that Ball, who had no political strength of his own at the time of his appointment, will make way for Governor Stassen, forcing Lindbergh to face a formidable opponent at the outset. But Minnesota politics are complicated. Governor Stassen and the Old Guard Republicans have never been particularly friendly, and the relationship has steadily worsened. Republican National Committeeman Roy Dunn manipulated the last legislature, of which he is a member, in a manner calculated to humble the Governor. Dunn and Lindbergh are reported to be very close, with Dunn expected to seek the nomination for governor should Lindbergh enter the senatorial primary. It is interesting that in the 1938 campaign against Governor Elmer A. Benson, Farmer-Laborite, Dunn, with other Old Guard leaders, was guilty of fairly extensive Jew-baiting. The strategy was to charge domination of the Farmer-Labor Party by Jews—and, *per se*, Communists.

Lindbergh would stand an excellent chance of cutting across party lines. Meddling in some one else's primary is an old custom with Minnesota voters. A large number of Farmer-Laborites might rally to Lindbergh in memory of his father, who in 1918 was their first gubernatorial candidate, or to injure Stassen, or because of strong isolationist opinions. Even more important, a large section of the population probably believes that Lindbergh, who seems to have had out of life about all one man ought to expect, is above "partisan politics." That is a factor anywhere, and particularly in the Middle West.

If Lindbergh obtained the Republican nomination, the Roosevelt Administration would have difficulty in coming to grips with him. The Democrats, in a minority anyway, are hopelessly split. The Farmer-Laborites are also badly disorganized, with the leader of the "conservative" wing, Hjalmar Petersen, candidate for governor in 1940, a Lindbergh admirer.

Entrance of the United States into the war would of course reduce Lindbergh's support, and his Nazi decoration would haunt him. But the stakes are enormously high. A victory in the primary election would be a blow to the Wendell Willkie faction of the G. O. P., since Governor Stassen has in general supported President Roosevelt's foreign policy. A victory in the final campaign would not only establish Lindbergh as a tremendous vote-getter but, since the President would of necessity bend every effort to defeat him, be a vindication of his policies. He would be standing on an excellent springboard for a jump to the Republican nomination for the Presidency in 1944.

The Middle West is certain to see some turbulent battles next year even though Lindbergh decides against placing his name before the voters. (He must establish residence within the next seven months in order to qualify.) Phil LaFollette will probably attempt a comeback in Wisconsin. The miserable failure of his National Progressive Party with its echoes of National Socialism seems to have disappointed but not to have chastened him. He has a large following in Wisconsin still, and of late he has spent a great deal of time in organizing a youth movement. Senator Wheeler and Senator Nye

are not required to defend their seats next year and will be free to stump for isolationist candidates in other states. Probably William Lemke, Father Coughlin's old candidate, who ran unsuccessfully for the Senate last year with Nye's support, will try to regain his seat in the House.

The outcome of these struggles has an importance far beyond the issue of aid, peaceful or shooting, to Britain and Russia. A desperate national battle may be beginning over what kind of society the United States is to have after the war. There can be no doubt that Lindbergh and a number of the men around him see the isolationist movement as a means not only eventually to overturn the New Deal but to usher in the American wave of the future.

As a testing ground the Middle West has advantages for both sides. It is a region to which Vernon Parrington in his "Main Currents of American Thought" credited the largest contributions to American democracy. With its pioneer emphasis on individual liberty, the Middle West could not but view the establishment of European dictatorships with loathing. It hates and fears Hitler to a greater degree than does perhaps any other section of the nation. But the very same instincts are the cause of conflicting feelings. The bogy of all agrarian movements has been Wall Street. Even small-town bankers, at heart twice as conservative as J. P. Morgan, look askance at Eastern financiers. Convinced that the last war was fought for Wall Street, the Middle West is fearful that this one, if we get in it, will be, too. There never has been popular opposition to aid for Britain, but the argument that each step is a forward one in a plot to take the United States into war has been effective.

One movement, sometimes overlooked as a political factor, must be taken into account. Having failed in their bids for national political power, the farmers quietly built powerful and secure cooperatives which now embrace a considerable majority of the rural population. And a principal item in the extensive educational program of the cooperators is the study of fascism. Hatred of Hitler is not enough—the cooperators learn the causes of fascism and the subtleties of its language.

In the end, the question will be whether the old spirit of agrarian revolt which was responsible for the Australian ballot, the recall and referendum, the direct primary, popular election of Senators, the income tax—to mention a few democratic advances—can be perverted to other uses. Lindbergh has indicated some capacity for the necessary cunning. He hints at chaos and change, frightening small-town business men and well-to-do farmers—here he is aided by the German-Russian war, which opens a new avenue for the charge of communism against the Roosevelt Administration. To the poorer folks Lindbergh speaks of sinister forces at work and demands that home problems be solved—problems in which he has heretofore shown no interest.

The approach is, of course, a fascist one. A Hitler victory would undoubtedly benefit Lindbergh's side, but a Hitler defeat would not automatically destroy it. Americans hate fascism in its tangible European form, but there is no assurance that they understand it well enough to avoid seduction by a native variation. If he is as determined as he appears, Lindbergh is certain to lead, or at least act as spokesman for, a powerful movement in the Middle West.

In the Wind

FLIP-FLOP: On May 14, as reported in this column, fascist leader Joe McWilliams said of Stalin: "I do not ask you to admire the man, but you cannot deny that he has put his country first and has accomplished tremendous things for the Russian people, and no doubt will rid the country . . . of the Jews." On June 27 McWilliams had this to say: "Already Hitler is at the gates of Minsk. . . . Russia—that great religious country—will welcome Hitler as the liberator . . . the Soviets never fulfilled their promises of bread, peace, and land. . . . Now Hitler will win them over. . . . Hitler is the Sir Galahad of white Christians fighting for freedom against the international Jews."

THE KEYNES PLAN for compulsory savings, or its equivalent under an American name, will be put before Congress sometime next winter.

IN THE NEW State Department affidavits which must be signed by those sponsoring the admission of refugees into this country, the signer must declare that the person in question has never been a Communist or an Anarchist. Nowhere in the entire form is there a question pertaining to Nazi or fascist sympathies.

TWO DEFENDANTS in last year's trial of sixteen members of the Christian Front in Brooklyn are now in the armed forces—one in the navy, one in the army.

THE FOLLOWING HEADLINES appeared in the New York *Enquirer* for July 14: "Interventionism Violates Monroe Doctrine" (editorial); "Roosevelt Violates Monroe Doctrine, Say Nazis" (page 9).

FLANDERS HALL, the publishing house which has released several openly Nazi books, is trying to cash in on the publicity of the America First Committee. Its most recent book, "We Must Save the Republic," by Representative Stephen Day of Illinois, is described on the cover as "a Flanders Hall–America First book."

[*We invite our readers to submit material for In the Wind—either clippings with source and date or stories that can be clearly authenticated. A prize of $5 will be awarded each month for the best item.*—EDITORS THE NATION.]

A Native at Large

BY JONATHAN DANIELS

Virginia Democracy

IT PROBABLY isn't polite any longer to laugh at any aspect of democracy. Maybe it isn't even patriotic to smile. But if it isn't, the patriots ought not to be funny. And they are.

There's Virginia, God bless her. Out of her past Patrick Henry, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson march in the heads of patriotic politicians everywhere. John D. Rockefeller has spent millions recreating Williamsburg, the colonial capital, as a sort of backdrop for the American dreaming about the American democracy. In the Norfolk area today the arsenal of democracy has one of its chief sources of supply. There are new public-housing projects for defense workers along the shores of the rivers where the colonial mansions stand. Smithfield hams are shipped by the thousands north and west now from a town just across the river from the place where Captain John Smith's lazy gentlemen starved. But this month Virginia is engaged on two projects.

Item one is a private civil war with Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and North Carolina over the right to use in tourist advertising the phrase "where America was born," or variants of it.

Item two is the Democratic primary on August 5, in which, according to all indications, politicians who will preserve the poll tax will be elected.

This business of the American birthplace is undoubtedly an important matter when you are advertising for tourists. And tourists are still important, as well as defense contracts. Two hundred thousand tourists go annually to Williamsburg, and the pull which brings them is this contested American cradle plus Mr. Rockefeller's reerected capitol. Such a cradle is worth defending.

Historians may well agree that that first permanent settlement in 1607 at Jamestown established what Virginius Dabney in the Richmond *Times-Dispatch* calls "the indisputable, ironclad, triple-plated, copper-riveted, twenty-four-carat fact that Virginia is the one and only cradle of the republic." Though a citizen of one of the contesting states I'm inclined to agree. I even hope that Virginians are right when they say, as they said in their own state guide, that "the weary travelers who disembarked at Jamestown established not only the first permanent English settlement in America but a democratic ideal that may wane but will never die."

I still think it is funny for Virginia officials to start arguing about it in the month before the election in which once again Virginians are going to preserve the poll tax, leaving in effect the control of government in a state of nearly three million people in the hands of not many more than a hundred thousand voters. Party primary and poll tax together make that a fact. I have nothing against Virginia, but I am afraid that after all I am not amused by those who in great solemnity make a joke out of democracy. And that seems to me to be what Virginia has done.

In 1901 without a vote of the people Virginia adopted a poll-tax constitutional amendment which has disfranchised not only Negroes but quite as many poor white people. Today a good many Virginians, like Virginius Dabney and members of the Southern Electoral Reform League, which has its office in Richmond, want to get rid of the poll tax. And what procedure in their democracy does that require? As a Vermonter might say, it's real cute. Repeal of the poll tax must be first approved by two legislatures, each elected by voters who have paid their poll taxes. Then the repeal must be approved by the people—but "the people" will be only those who paid their poll taxes (cumulative for three years) six months in advance of election.

The Virginia pattern shows that it is easy for the people to lose their liberties in this American democracy, but even in democracy it is hard as hell to get them back. Those politicians who talked at home about George Washington, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson fixed that in 1901, and they fixed it in an "ironclad, triple-plated, copper-riveted" way. They have had plenty of assistance from patriots in Virginia politics ever since. Carter Glass, who has just been unanimously elected president pro tem of the United States Senate and who is ardent in his desire for American aid in defense of democracy, was almost papa of the poll tax. He hasn't said anything against it yet. Nor has Virginia's boss, Senator Harry Flood Byrd—who is afraid democracy is going to be permanently damaged by the New Deal.

Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, North Carolina, and any other infringers on Virginia's claim to be this democracy's cradle ought to be ashamed of themselves. Virginia, it seems to me, has a first-class claim on democracy's cradle and also on democracy's jail. It's a joke, but at this time in the world's history it isn't so funny in this country as it would be perhaps in Berlin or Rome. There they could laugh and laugh.

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

The Unlamenting

BY ROLFE HUMPHRIES

Even the sweet and gentle find
Some tinge of acid in the mind,
Some small residuum of scorn
To use on men who never mourn;

Who never sorrow, never doubt,
Whose pasteboard fiber does without
The normal salt, the simple tear,
Breathing in arid atmosphere;

With fretfulness and petty rage
An unrewarding heritage,
And with no angel to relieve
Their inability to grieve.

Tate Versus History

REASON IN MADNESS. By Allen Tate. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.50.

THESE are critical essays: some are literary criticism in a narrow sense, some in a broad, and some are not literary criticism at all. The essays are disconnected and occasional, the preface says, but that is not one's impression; Mr. Tate's style, method, and point of view give the book a surprising unity. The style will please anyone: few people write English with so much strength, ease, and wit. The method is what Mr. Tate confesses it is—the attack. The point of view—well, most of this review will be about that; roughly, it is an American variant of Eliot's, more downright and logical, not so religious, evasive, or "humble."

Mr. Tate's criticism of critics—Arnold, Coleridge, Richards, Daiches—is sound, brilliant, and crushing; he altogether avoids the filial relaxation of standards that is our customary tribute to the distinguished dead. His criticism of poetry, less intensive, is generally quite as good. His critical standards resemble Blackmur's, Winters's (minus Winters's incomparable neo-classical excesses), or Eliot's (minus Eliot's unconscious residual passion for the experimental). As a critic of poetry he has the initial advantage of being one of the four or five greatest living poets; his judgments are occasionally perverse, always acute, and usually simply right. He rarely amplifies or justifies these judgments; consequently he misses the advantage critics like Blackmur and Empson get from showing the reader exactly what they are saying, and why. He has an odd habit of conclusively demonstrating the quality of a poet by means of a little metrical analysis: it is an idiosyncrasy that almost assumes the proportions of a vice. Most of the literary criticism in this book is obviously first-rate; and there is, besides, the most brilliant attack on scholarship—*PMLA* variety—that I have ever seen.

Mr. Tate, fighting desperately to preserve traditional European culture, is part of an old and growing campaign against science, progress, humanitarianism, Economic and Perfectible Man. The movement has had two wings, both right: the irrational, which has attacked in the name of intuition, blood, the folk; and the rationalistic, which has attacked, with remorseless scholastic logic, in the name of the religion, art, philosophy it has seen being destroyed. Men like Mr. Tate have denounced the evils of what they call finance-capitalism; they have denounced the scientists and industrialists who, discarding art, religion, and philosophy as meaningless luxuries, have tried to throw away half our culture. But they are themselves eager to sacrifice the scientific, mathematical, and technical half of European culture, in order to return to the good society (traditional, theological, based on property, the "primary medium through which man expressed his moral nature") that is the womb from which the rest of us have struggled to get free. They approximate to that familiar limit, the thirteenth century, by means of an odd neo-Cartesian program of Systematic Belief. They are more hard-hearted than hard-headed; about their attitude there is something conscientiously partial, pre-scientific, provincial in both space and time—they can believe so much more and ignore so much more than other people. It is not so much the truth as the necessity of religion that impresses Mr. Tate; his theology is a blank and hypothetical quasi-Catholicism—the Christianity of *as if*. The education he wants is Latin, Greek, and philosophy. (He is a dualist—the Carnation or contented kind.) He writes: "I may look at English history with Hilaire Belloc—as I happen to do with reservations—as the decline of moral standards and human liberty from the twelfth century to our day." Well—such men are a distinguished and very forlorn hope; what they are fighting is history. Their attitude seems to me mistaken as truth and badly mistaken as tactics: they are all campaigning for the philosopher-King Stork. It has been later than they think for four hundred years.

But today, when everybody realizes that what we have been needing wasn't a change of system but a change of heart, that it wasn't economics we should have been studying but ethics (or should I say military tactics?); when all the fellow-travelers lie home with their heads under their pillows, dreaming of democracy and liberalism and religion—today one gets a perverse pleasure from a confirmed old reactionary like Mr. Tate, who sticks to his opinions for all the worst reasons, instead of deserting them for all the best. He calls his book "Reason in Madness," a light surviving in the "mad abstract dark"; we can get nowhere by retorting that we are reason, and Mr. Tate and his fellows the mad concrete dark. We must manage, somehow, a climate of opinion in which both are varieties of reason—and of madness too. A good many things are going to be taken from us; really to be reasonable, to be *willing*, to get where we can what good we can, is something we must lose for ourselves.

RANDALL JARRELL

Wavell's War

WAR IN THE DESERT. By Raoul Aglion. Henry Holt and Company. $2.75.

THE Middle East is a military term for a vast area perhaps twice the size of the United States. It stretches from Malta to Aden and from Central Africa to Greece. The defense of this tremendous territory, recognized as vital to British Empire economy and the Allied war effort, depended at the beginning of this war on General Weygand's large French army and the British and French fleets.

France withdrew from the war as Italy entered. With a handful of troops and a reduced navy England faced Italy's much-advertised navy and its huge African armies, totaling over 500,000 men and referred to by Il Duce as the Invincibles. These original Italian armies and most of the fleet have been wiped out by the British, who, up to last April when I left the Middle East, had never had more than 300,000 men as effectives available for General Wavell in all of that huge area.

Those 300,000 men were the strangest conglomeration of soldiers ever brought under one command—Australians, New Zealanders, Poles, Free French, Free Belgians, Indians, Dutch, South Africans, Czechs, Austrians, Canadians, Jews, and Arabs, as well as some crack Scottish and English regiments. Now there are also Serbian and Greek units. Just before I left, a Free Italian corps was in formation and doing a brisk enlistment among the anti-Fascists in the military prison camps of General Graziani's veterans.

Raoul Aglion, an expert on Near Eastern affairs for the French Foreign Office, saw the war in the Middle East unfold while he was serving as a soldier in Syria and later as a member of the staff of the French legation in Cairo. Finally the Nazi leanings of Vichy drove him into the Free French movement and General de Gaulle's army. He is now in the United States on a lecture tour for the Free French. Certainly all this constitutes an ideal background for writing the story of the Middle East in this war.

Unfortunately nearly a third of the book is spent in describing wars in the same theater ranging back to the time of the Pharaohs, over 5,000 years ago. However valuable this may be, it is tiresomely long and only serves to reduce the space available for the anecdotal narrative of contemporary events at which M. Aglion excels.

Accounts of Free Frenchmen who dared both death and the safety of their families to get out of Syria, the tale of the attack on Taranto, episodes of Wavell's miracle campaign in Libya, a stirring story of how a British unit spontaneously "surrendered" its colors to a Free French regiment—these are so excitingly told as to make us want many more. Here is definitely "untotal" war, and these tales restore one's faith in the existence of ideals, loyalty, and duty at a time when such concepts are unfashionable in America, though we need them badly.

For the first time, except in *The Nation,* M. Aglion tells America who the German nigger in the Middle Eastern woodpile is and calls him by name—Otto von Hentig. This amazing man led an anti-British crusade in Afghanistan during the last war. He rode a horse from there to Peiping. He was ejected from Poland as a kidnaper and from South America as an attempted murderer. He has been twice accredited to the United States as a diplomat. He has posed as an archaeologist. He is said to be Dr. Haushofer's No. 1 fifth-column organizer. His career would certainly have made a more interesting chapter than that on the Crusaders.

Whatever miracles British arms have accomplished in the Middle East have been accomplished in spite of the obstacles erected by the stupid policy of the Foreign Office, a policy which might be called "cricket for Islam." M. Aglion glosses over far too much of this, but he does say of Egypt's absurd neutrality: "When the Fascists were established deep in Egyptian territory and were struggling for the conquest of the kingdom, Egypt still remained neutral. The British did not seem to exert the slightest pressure to bring her into the war, as if that had no importance. Is it not extraordinary that some of the greatest battles of this war were fought in a country which today is a neutral?" It is far more than extraordinary—it is stupid—for England to allow a pro-Fascist king and government to exist in the rear of its armies. Arabs hold cricket morality in the greatest contempt and mistake it for mere weakness.

It has been the same story in all the Middle Eastern countries—silly cricket diplomacy. In Bagdad until last winter the British had as ambassador Sir Basil Newton of unsavory appeasement fame. He insisted on dealing with the Iraqis as if they were a visiting Rugger team at Eton. This played directly into von Hentig's hands, and the Iraqi revolt of April resulted. British arms saved a dangerous situation, but had the Germans not had their eyes already on Russia the result might have been disastrous.

That Wavell has been able to muddle through with few men and fewer machines is both romantic and glorious. That it was made necessary by stupidity in London takes away a good deal of the glamor. There are signs that Mr. Churchill has begun to change all this. He has finally entered Syria, and he has sent a great and realistic Arab expert to replace Newton in Bagdad, Sir Kinahan Cornwallis, head of the Arab Bureau in the last war and thus Lawrence's boss. He knows definitely that cricket is not an Arabic game and will be more of a match for von Hentig.

As a picture of the theater of the Middle Eastern war this book is good. As a collection of stirring episodes it is even better. As a criticism of British diplomacy it is far too easy on Mr. Eden and his predecessors in the Foreign Office. For this M. Aglion must be excused; this is war time, and the buttons on his Free French uniform are British.

PETER STEVENS

The Massie Ore of British Letters

THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. Edited by F. W. Bateson. The Macmillan Company. Four Volumes. $32.50.

LONG awaited, these volumes will be long discussed and longer used by all who cherish the unsearchable riches of English letters. The reasons for the continuing and abundant use of the work are implicit in its clearly expressed purpose. In the words of the editor, the Bibliography "sets out to record, as far as possible in chronological order, the au-

thors, titles, and editions, with relevant critical matter, of all the writings in book form (whether in English or Latin) that can still be said to possess some literary interest, by natives of what is now the British Empire, up to the year 1900." Volume I covers the years from 600 to 1660, Volume II the period from 1660 to 1800, and Volume III the nineteenth century. Volume IV is an index. Such a record supplies a significant mass of material nowhere else conveniently available. The book will be an occasional reference work for the general reader, an inspiration to or the despair of the young student, and an essential tool for every scholar in English literature or cognate fields. In taking all British letters for their province, Mr. Bateson and his collaborators, among whom are some of the leading scholars in England and the United States, have essayed a task of the first magnitude. Neither they nor the users of the book can be expected to be completely satisfied with every detail of so massive a compilation. This fact is not important. The walls, the roof, the entire superstructure of even the loftiest structures can be repaired or rebuilt if the foundation has been well designed and strongly constructed. So it is with a compilation of the magnitude of the Bibliography. No one who examines it thoughtfully can doubt that it is the foundation upon which all subsequent work in English literary bibliography will be based. The work contains many errors; these can be corrected. Its arrangement by types within literary periods seems to many unnecessarily confusing; this order can be entirely changed in later editions. The index is inadequate; it can be expanded to any desired length. In brief, the disorders of the work are functional rather than organic. A few treatments by a literary family doctor, with occasional advice from scholarly specialists, will easily cure all the ills from which the book now suffers.

In order to make detailed comment on every section of the Bibliography one would need to have special knowledge of every author and literary trend found in thirteen centuries of British letters. Obviously no person possesses such knowledge. It is possible, therefore, to make specific criticism of only a few sections.

It is stated that the lists of relevant critical matter are selective. Though one accepts the necessity of this selectivity, serious questions nevertheless arise. It is rash to doubt the judgment of Professor Renwick concerning Spenserian scholarship, but even so one wonders whether three-quarters of a page suffices to list an adequate selection of the biographical and critical papers on Spenser. Similarly, one hesitates to question the decisions of David H. Stevens, the editor of the "Reference Guide to Milton." It must be said, however, that many highly important papers on Milton are omitted from the list of articles given in the Bibliography. Saurat's "Milton and the Zohar," Fletcher's "Milton and Yosippon," Wolfe's "Milton and Mirabeau," Bank's "Miltonic Rhythm" are only a few of the papers essential to any *apparatus criticus* of Milton which do not appear. It is surprising also to note the omission of any reference to the editions of "Areopagitica" by James Thomson (1738) and by T. Holt White (1819), with a translation by Mirabeau.

Some of the cross-references are disturbingly faulty. On page 458, under Cowley, there is a note "See pp. 655-87"; on page 655 there is a note "vide p. 459." The important essay by Herbert Cory, "The School of Spenser, the Fletchers, and Milton," appears under both Giles and Phineas Fletcher but is not listed under either Spenser or Milton.

The "Current Lists of English Studies" omits the following valuable bibliographical compilations: Annual Bibliography, in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association;* Renaissance Bibliography, in *Studies in Philology;* The Romantic Movement, in *English Literary History;* English Literature, 1660-1800, in the *Philological Quarterly;* and the Shakespeare Bibliography in the *Bulletin of the Shakespeare Association of America.*

The *Yellow Book* (1894-97) is listed merely as a periodical in a long list of occasional and enduring magazines. Its significance is not suggested, and the considerable critical literature about it is entirely omitted. Although John Oliver Hobbes (Pearl Craigie) is included, her more important contemporary, Henry Harland, is left out.

Admitting all these errors of omission and commission, however, the Bibliography remains a great and brave achievement. All who love letters must be grateful to the editors and publishers for the vision and fortitude they have displayed in making such a book, and for the gift of it in this dark hour of hate and destruction. Within these volumes is the matter of Britain, which neither time nor the fury of bestial strife can destroy.

DONALD A. ROBERTS

The Western Democracy

ROBERT DALE OWEN: A BIOGRAPHY. By Richard William Leopold. Harvard University Press. $4.50.

THE INCORRIGIBLE IDEALIST. By Elinor Pancoast and Anne E. Lincoln. Principia Press. $2.

THIS country has fathered many personalities, colorful, quixotic, and rich in their contributions to our history. Many of them have been eulogized in song and story and are now a part of our folklore. The popular interest in one or another of these figures waxes and wanes with peculiar historical coincidence. On the other hand, there is still a host of personalities who remain unsung and unnoticed, until an accident brings to light one of these unknown actors. In these days a menacing threat to our democratic institutions is responsible for a resurgence of interest in the men and women in our history who helped those institutions come into being.

Thus two biographies of Robert Dale Owen have recently appeared; the one by Richard Leopold is the first full-length portrait of a man whose long life of seventy years spanned the political and economic ferment of American development. It is a scholarly book of interest not only to historians but to sociologists and psychologists. Robert Dale Owen, the eldest son of Robert Owen, industrialist and socialist reformer, started life with the disadvantages—and advantages—of a guinea pig in an experimental school. His Pestalozzian education at Hofwyl, Switzerland, equipped him with an unorthodox curiosity about human beings, their ideas, and institutions. In 1826 he was his father's representative at New Harmony, Indiana, that extraordinary adventure in communal living and progressive education. He became the editor of the New Harmony *Gazette,* a paper dedicated to

free thinking and the discussion of all human matters—among them religion, morals, and sexual relationships. Together with Frances Wright, the social reformer who was concerned with reeducating Negro slaves to prepare them for freedom, he embarked upon a career of radical journalism. As editors of the *Free Enquirer*, the name of the *Gazette* after it was brought to New York City, he and Frances Wright became the protagonists there of the bitter struggles of the first Workingmen's Party. It was at this time that Robert Dale Owen valiantly espoused birth control, free public education, and a revolution in the social and legal status of women—a period in his life which Mr. Leopold characterizes as that of "the reformer." It is also the period which marked the differences between Robert Dale and his father, for the former, always the more practical person, was interested in results and did not find it too difficult to exchange his old ideals for new ones.

Robert Dale Owen's marriage marked the beginning of another era for him. He settled down in New Harmony and became closely identified with the political development of the Middle West. He was elected to the Indiana legislature from Posey County and played an important role in the construction of the Indiana constitution of 1850 and the establishment of the public-school system for the state. He became absorbed in a campaign for election to the United States Congress, and every radical utterance he made in his youth confronted him. He was defeated, but four years later this "upstart, foreign demagogue and disorganizer," the man who "would disgrace the gallows," was elected to the national legislature.

Interested in the philosophy of Manifest Destiny, which sanctioned the expansion of this country to the Northwest and the Southwest, he was one of those eloquent orators who made an astute plea for expansion regardless of its implications with respect to the burning slavery question. Despite his early affiliations with Frances Wright at Nashoba, Owen was never a rabid abolitionist. Primarily he was, at this stage of his development, an opportunistic reformer.

He fathered the law establishing the Smithsonian Institute as an educational center, and even though that institution fell short of his aspirations for it, he became an industrious regent, using his eloquence and journalistic ability in its behalf. His career as the Western Democrat terminates with his political defeat. With his appointment to Naples as American consul, his career as a lawmaker and reformer ended. His new life and interests were centered in the field of diplomacy and, curiously enough, of spiritualism. He justified the latter interest to Cornelius C. Felton, president of Harvard University and a bitter enemy of spiritualism, in a long letter. "Desiring after twenty years of public life some more tranquil and philosophical field of labor," he wrote, "I discovered none which appears to promise more useful results than this."

Modern psychologists might explain this interest in many ways. Certainly the last years of Owen's life might be characterized as an intellectual anticlimax. His writings on spiritualism, his séances, his strong mysticism culminated in a short stay at the Indiana Hospital for the Insane. He was dismissed, and then started writing his autobiography.

The two biographies are in a nature complementary. D. Leopold has performed a monumental job of compilation and annotation. Miss Pancoast and Miss Lincoln, in the brief presentation, do an intriguing job of interpretation and analysis. We are grateful for the portrayal of a personality "which illuminates the social and political scene during a half-century of America's most stirring history."

THERESA WOLFSON

Order your

BOOKS

from THE NATION

At the request of many readers who reside in communities in which no bookshop has been established, *The Nation* offers to deliver any book to your door at the regular publisher's price (postfree) provided payment is received with the order or publisher's price plus postage if sent C. O. D.

Please address your orders to

THE READERS' SERVICE DIVISION

The Nation • 55 Fifth Avenue • New York

PUBLISHED THIS WEEK

ECONOMIC SHANGHAI: HOSTAGE TO POLITICS, 1937-1941. By Robert W. Barnett. American Council Institute of Pacific Relations. $2.

THE AIRMEN SPEAK. By the Officers and Men of the Royal Air Force. Selected by Wing Commander Bentley Beauman. Doubleday, Doran. $2.50.

THE ECONOMIC HISTORY OF LIBERIA. By George W. Brown. Associated Publishers. $3.

CHRISTIANITY IN A CHANGING WORLD. By Shirley Jackson Case. Harper. $2.

SAVAGE MESSIAH. By H. S. Ede. Knopf. New Edition. $2.50.

I WAS A NAZI FLIER. By Gottfried Leske. Edited by Curt Riess. Dial Press. $2.50.

POEMS ON SEVERAL OCCASIONS. By Josephine Miles. New Directions. $1.

IOWA: THE RIVERS OF HER VALLEYS. By William J. Petersen. The State Historical Society of Iowa. $3.

THE POETRY OF FLIGHT. An Anthology Edited by Selden Rodman. Duell, Sloan, and Pearce. $2.50.

THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD AFFAIRS IN 1940. By Whitney H. Shepardson in Collaboration with William O. Scroggs. Harper. $3.50.

DIGGING FOR MRS. MILLER. Some Experiences of an Air-Raid Warden. By John Strachey. Random House. $1.25.

FISHERMEN AT WAR. By Leo Walmsley. Doubleday, Doran. $2.50.

SELECTED POEMS. By John Wheelwright. New Directions. $1.

DEMOCRACY IS DIFFERENT. A Series of Lectures at Oberlin College by Carl Friedrich Wittke, Oscar Jaszi, Jan Blahoslav Kozak, John Donald Lewis, Giuseppe Antonio Borgese, Henry Russell Spencer, Eduard Heimann, Carl Joachim Friedrich, Ernest Hatch Wilkins. Harper. $2.50.

IN BRIEF

THE KEYS OF THE KINGDOM. By A. J. Cronin. Little, Brown. $2.50.

Drawing on a time-tested store of sure-fire characters—the poor orphan, the grasping aunt with the spoiled son, the benevolent, free-thinking doctor, and so on—Dr. Cronin has built up another of his competent, heart-warming, but hardly memorable stories: this time about a Scottish Catholic priest who serves for many years as a missionary in China and finally returns to face and overcome the narrowness and provincialism of his church at home.

BRAZILIAN SKETCHES. By Rudyard Kipling. Doubleday, Doran. $2.

This small book of sketches not previously published in this country in book form describes a whirlwind visit to the Brazilian cities of Pernambuco, Rio de Janeiro, Santos, and Sao Paolo. With his usual skill Kipling has revealed the essential characteristics of the towns and their inhabitants, giving impressions at once exact and intense.

RECORDS

THE remaining July releases of Victor include Alfvén's "Midsummer Vigil," a slight but enjoyable piece for orchestra, well played by Grevilius with the Stockholm Concert Association Orchestra (Set 788, $2.50). Slight also, with a few amusing moments, is Saint-Saëns's "Carnival of the Animals," which gets a glitteringly streamlined performance by Stokowski with the Philadelphia Orchestra and assisting pianists (Set 785, $3.50). And quite dull are the Five German Dances of Schubert that Barbirolli performs with the New York Philharmonic-Symphony on two single discs (2162/3, $1.50).

The Adagio K. 261 for violin that Mozart wrote as an alternative slow movement for the Concerto K. 219 is one of the three pieces of Mozart that I found uninteresting when Milstein played them with the New Friends of Music Orchestra; and I find it uninteresting now again when played by Ossy Renardy on another single disc (18032, $1). Nor do I like the piece on the reverse side—the movement which Brahms contributed to the sonata that he wrote with Schumann and Dietrich. Renardy's performances are simply phrased. Still other singles offer two finely wrought and enjoyable settings by Duparc of poems by Baudelaire, "L'invitation au voyage" and "La vie antérieure," beautifully sung by Panzéra (18051, $1); Robert McBride's briskly arid Quintet for oboe and strings, well played by the composer and the Coolidge Quartet (2159, $.75); and Bach's great D minor Toccata and Fugue for organ, with the Toccata played effectively by E. Power Biggs, but with the polyphony of the Fugue at certain points the confused jumble of brilliantly recorded organ sound that Biggs so often has given us (18058, $1).

The Columbia University Bookstore has issued three more ten-inch records ($1 each) of vocal polyphony sung by the Columbia University Choir under Lowell P. Beveridge. I like Sweelinck's "O Seigneur, loué sera ton nom," Dowland's "As Pants the Hart," Hassler's "Verbum caro factum est" (105); and best of all Gibbons's "O Lord, in Thy Wrath," Pitoni's "Cantate Domino," and Eccard's "O Lamm Gottes unschuldig" (107, on which the labels should be transposed). Marenzio's "Gaudent in coelis" and Palestrina's "Dies sanctificatus" (106) I find less interesting. The singing is good and excellently recorded; but the wide frequency-range extends to surface noise.

In the Decca album of Kansas City Jazz (Set 214, $3.50) I have enjoyed Mary Lou Williams's piano-playing in "Baby Dear" (18122); but the best thing in the set is the coupling (18125) of two old Basie Orchestra sides—"Good Morning Blues" and "Doggin' Around." In the Decca Anthology of White Jazz (Set 183, $2.60) are two fine performances—the Jimmy McPartland "Panama" (3522), with Dick Clark on tenor sax and Joe Harris on trombone; and the New Orleans Rhythm Kings "Tin Roof Blues" (3523), with Wingy Mannone on trumpet, George Brunies on trombone, and Sidney Arodin on clarinet. Decca also offers Reginald Gardiner's monologue "Trains" (Set 215, $2), which is amusing the first time, and which I did not try a second time. And another amusing record offers Danny Kaye's performances of "Jenny" and "Tchaikovsky" from "Lady in the Dark" (Columbia 36025).

B. H. HAGGIN

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS

THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, $1; Canadian, $1. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Index to Labor Articles, Public Affairs Information Service, Dramatic Index. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.

CONTRIBUTORS

LOUIS DOLIVET, French authority on international affairs, is general secretary of the newly organized Free World Association.

BARBARA WOOTTON, well-known English economist and educator, is one of the leaders of the Federal Union movement.

DALE KRAMER has contributed to *Harper's, Survey Graphic,* and other magazines. He is now working on a novel dealing with the rising of Western farmers in the early 1930's.

RANDALL JARRELL is instructor in English at the University of Texas. The recently published "Five Young American Poets" contains a number of his poems.

PETER STEVENS is the pseudonym of an American writer who has recently returned from a year's stay in the Near East.

DONALD A. ROBERTS is assistant professor of English at the College of the City of New York.

THERESA WOLFSON, coauthor of "Frances Wright: Free Enquirer," is assistant professor of economics at Brooklyn College.

The Momentous Issue!

SYMPOSIUM

"THE WORLD vs. HITLER"

SPEAKERS:

PIERRE COT
Former Minister of Aviation of France

LEONARD ENGEL
Military news analyst

KAREL HUDEC
Acting Consul-General of Czechoslovakia

AND OTHERS

AIR-COOLED
MANHATTAN CENTER
Thirty-fourth St. & Eighth Avenue

WEDNESDAY
JULY 30—8 P. M.

Tickets: 50c in advance. 65c at door
Reserved section: $1.00

On sale: Bookfair, 133 W. 44 St. Manhattan Center office, New Masses, 461 4 Ave.

Auspices: NEW MASSES

Letters to the Editors

Van Paassen vs. Rosinski on Geopolitical Planning

Dear Sirs: In his review of my booklet "The Time Is Now" in *The Nation* for June 28 Herbert Rosinski applies the terms "grotesque" and "falsification of history" to my statements to the effect that the world-domination ambitions of the German General Staff under the influence of the geopolitical movement are not a Hitler development but have been in existence for almost half a century. When he says that "German foreign policy has had no such continuity," he is right. I have never charged the German foreign policy with consistency. It is my contention that, irrespective of that foreign policy's orientation, military planning commissions have been working out blueprints for world-conquering wars—and this whether Germany was a Kaiserreich, a republic, or a totalitarian state.

If Mr. Rosinski does not believe me, he might read some of the papers published by the late Robert Lansing, who marshaled an impressive array of facts to prove this very statement.

Mr. Rosinski might also read with real interest the article by Alfred Vagts in the *Political Science Quarterly* of December, 1939, and March, 1940, in which the author offers amazing evidence that back in 1897 German naval authorities expressed the view that Germany's future navy would have the task of abolishing the Monroe Doctrine.

If Mr. Rosinski thinks that I am falsifying history he makes me an accomplice of President Theodore Roosevelt, who unequivocally stated that he had positive information, based on German General Staff documents, of a contemplated German attack on this country.

Finally I should like to cite, as evidence that Hitler is not the first German ruler to have sponsored planning academies for world conquest, the occanographic and geopolitical books of Friedrich Ratzel (who died in 1904), Josef Marz, Walter Schmidt, Karl Haushofer, and others who in the last forty-five years have nursed the present geopolitical ideal.

PIERRE VAN PAASSEN

New York, July 15

Dear Sirs: In his attempt to refute my criticism of his fantastic statements about the influence of the Geopolitical Institute of Munich on German foreign policy since 1897, Mr. van Paassen is compelled to undertake a complete withdrawal from his original position. The points in his booklet against which my criticisms were primarily directed were: first, his statement that for nearly half a century the successive German governments, "whether a Kaiserreich, a republic, or a totalitarian state, enthusiastically sponsored a planning academy whose function was to develop a long-range project for the domination of the world"; second, the contention that such a long-range planning academy existed; third, his identification of it with the Geopolitical Institute, which he expressly asserted had "existed since 1897."

Mr. van Paassen now drops the first and last of these points, forswearing any intention of ascribing such continuity of planning for world conquest to the German *governments* and ascribing the actual planning no longer to the Geopolitical Institute but to some conveniently anonymous "military planning commissions," organs of the world-domination ambitions of the German General Staff and under the influence of the geopolitical movement for almost half a century.

Unfortunately for Mr. van Paassen, this marked recession from his original position in no way improves his situation. For not only did no German government prior to 1933 ever sponsor such long-range planning for world domination, but no such independent military planning commission, in any form, ever existed, and a "geopolitical movement," which now replaces the "Geopolitical Institute," was as non-existent in 1897, and for almost three decades thereafter, as the institute. As for the "world-domination ambitions" of the German General Staff, I can scarcely do better than to refer Mr. van Paassen to the article on Land and Sea Power in the Second German Reich by Alfred Vagts, in the *Journal of the American Military Institute*, Vol. III, p. 213. Mr. Vagts writes:

> Nothing could be more false than to characterize the pre-war Junker as imperialistic. The army, whatever territorial and kindred appetites it developed during the war, however misleading the march through Belgium must seem to the outside, was non-aggressive before 1914 except in its strategy. As the great General Staff put it in 1902, in a statement not intended for public use, "We want to conquer nothing, we merely want to defend what we own. We shall probably never be attackers but rather always be attacked. The necessary quick success can be brought us with certainty only by the offensive."

Nor do I find in Vagts's article on the German navy the "amazing evidence that back in 1897 German naval authorities expressed the view that Germany's future navy would have the task of abolishing the Monroe Doctrine." The truth is, as I happen to know from a searching and comprehensive investigation of the German navy's policy, that that policy in 1897 was predominantly directed against Great Britain, that the United States was envisaged, if at all, only as a very remote opponent, and that far from aiming at world domination its objectives were almost exclusively confined to the North Sea.

Mr. van Paassen, however, in his booklet supports his contention about the continuity of German planning for world domination by the following summary of the "formula" of Friedrich Ratzel, the great German geographer:

> If the Germans are to fulfil their destiny and become the masters of the world, they must reinforce their invincible army with just as powerful a fleet. This means that they must either make Britain their ally and partner, or, if that should prove impossible, compel the British to surrender their fleet and their shipbuilding yards. Nothing can prevent the Germans from accomplishing this task except a failure to recognize that the capture of the road to world conquest leads over the waterways.

In the whole of Ratzel's voluminous writings there is not a single paragraph, not even a single sentence, that would justify Mr. van Paassen in imputing these ideas to him. They are a pure invention of Mr. van Paassen's, made all the worse by the fact that they are tucked into a genuine summary of Ratzel's famous pamphlet "The Sea as the Source of the Greatness of Nations," thus creating the impression that they constituted the argument of that pamphlet. In reality the only direct reference to the purposes of the German navy I have been able to find in the pamphlet is a statement which confines the role of the navy to that of a battle fleet capable of keeping open the North Sea.

HERBERT ROSINSKI

Princeton, N. J., July 21

A M E

VOLUME

IN

THE SI

EDITO

The A

Nazify

ARTIC

A Tes

Squeez

Hague

Taxes

Witch

In the

BOOKS

Notes

". . .

From

Refuge

Music

LETTE

Managing

ROBERT BE

Published

55 Fifth A

ber 18, 187

8, 1879.